Issues Analysis Table

This table is to help understand the issues of Staff Accountability experienced by participants in the ICANN system. By identifying issues, understanding the things that contribute to those issues, and the impact the issues are having, we can build the evidence and information base for our work. Subsequently, once the problems are clear, we can work on proposed solutions.

The columns should be used as follows:

Issue - What is the problem? These should be matters that can be addressed by some change of process or culture - not individual performance concerns.
Contributions - what factors, processes, situations, cultural matters or other things might be causing the issue or making it hard to resolve?
Impacts - what is the impact of the issue? Try and describe who the impact is on and what the impact is, where possible.

This Staff Accountability process is about improving the processes and culture associated with staff accountability. It is not appropriate to identify individuals or to identify specific incidents in this table. The co-rapporteurs will delete any material of this sort which they observe.

Issue	Contributions to the issue	Impact/s
1. No forum in which community participants can safely raise and work through concerns about staff accountability or performance. (SA WG)	• Suggestion for a forum like this has not been made before? • Fear that given staff role in relation to contracted parties, criticism may lead to repercussions - that is where “safely raise” comes from	• Unexpressed concerns with performance mean potentially useful feedback does not reach the performance management system • ICANN organisation may feel unresponsive to community concerns not expressed due to fears
2. Staff (excluding the Policy staff) are seen as crossing the line from policy “implementation” to policy “development / decision” and there is no way to address that. (SA WG)	• Staff concern with ensuring that policy frameworks are implementable / consistent could lead to “problem solving” that is interpreted as “crossing the line” • Policy development process does not adequately document policy to an implementable state, leading staff implementation being seen as policy development • No process to reconcile policy implementation processes with development processes, leading to disagreements not being resolved • Staff sees implementation of policy as solely their responsibility as opposed to the responsibility of all parties required to implement the policies. As stated in Registry Letter to Staff (Should include link), the registries and registrars have made themselves	• Negative impact on relationships between policy implementation staff and community participants • Conflict between community and organisation • ICANN staff do not operate registries or registrars and therefore the impact of a staff only proposal can lead to unrealistic implementation mechanisms or those with a number of negative unintended consequences. •

	available to assist in those matters where implementation is dependent on their actions. ● Is *part of this concern rooted in the issue of disbanding the policy teams prior to implementation and then not having a clear mechanism for reconvening for guidance during implementation? I do sense that even informal offers to collaborate put staff at risk of "not following stated policy" or "acting independent of community-approved processes."* ● *New processes in gTLD world? Implementation Review Teams now exist, and may help with resolving this issue. Ref:* https://gnso.icann.org/en/drafts/policy-implementation-recommendations-01jun15-en.pdf*; however ICANN staff have been reluctant to use this process. We believe that ICANN staff views this new consensus policy to imply that an implementation team of the GNSO can be available if they request it, but they do not view this as a mandatory process.* ● *New GNSO expedited PDP provides for how to resolve such concerns as well.* ● *Historic PDP processes may still be facing this challenge.* ● *I* know that this issue is recognized amongst the Org, and the operating standards and process flows work are looking to further clarify and operationalize the ways to resolve these types of issues.	
3. There are concerns that the overall culture of the ICANN staff is less focused on supporting the community's work in policy development than it should be. (SA WG)	● Uncertain - no specific examples provided by the sub-group. Two historic examples of slow staff responses to information needs cited.	● If validated, a perception by the community of ICANN staff being focused on other matters
4. There's no institutionalised route for community feedback to be included in staff performance and accountability systems. (SA WG) [connected with Issue 1]	● Not requested or proposed in the past ● Traditional line of management approach has not sought feedback outside the organisation ● Possibility that community input might be unconstructive or negative ● The idea of presenting specific specific staff member feedback seems to run counter to the focus of these issues at a functional and not individual staff level. Is	● No formal way for community experience of performance and accountability to be taken into account by the organisation -> lower confidence in the organisation than otherwise ● Risk of a lack of "voice" on the part of those outside the organisation

	the concern here that there is no mechanism for providing input or for staff soliciting input on the effectiveness of the Org at a functional level?	
5. Staff may not be consistently meeting ICANN's accountability commitments in the way they summarize and substantively respond to recommendations or concerns expressed in public comments submitted by community members. (10 Mar F2F)	• Uncertain - unclear expectations? Resource constraints? Difference of view about requirements? • **Check against ATRT2 review recommendation** - a method to ask commenters to comment back on the summary and ask for clarifications, corrections etc. Reference: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/final-recommendations-31dec13-en.pdf (Recommendation 7.2) • independent of Avri's comment, i think there is quite a bit of variance in how not just different dept's in the Org, but also in how different Community groups leading the work, choose to handle addressing response to public comment.	• Inadequate consideration of public comments in consultation processes
6. No clear forum in which staff can safely raise and work through concerns about community members behavior or performance. (ICANN Org)	• Staff members have noted a similar concern about not having clear guidelines for raising concerns with community members they interact with, and also fear retaliation if issues or concerns are raised. • *Could be out of scope for the Staff Accountability work, but is a reasonable topic for future discussion in the ICANN system.* • *Or could be in scope as the mirror image of issue #1 and a solution may require solving both..*	• Environment could feel hostile to staff • Staff could become distrustful and overly cautious in its work • Staff may decide to leave
7. Concern about the compensation scheme including but not limited to at-risk bonus paid to staff. Specifically whether they may be policy related, or may relate to determining the completion target dates for community work, or other aspects of community activities within ICANN.	• The concern is that this may constitute an exogenous inducement, similar to those that the community must list in their SOI (Statements of Interest), without being known by community participants.. • Staff members often are in the position to recommend paths and possible solutions to the community members they work with. If there are incentives that may affect the recommendation they are making without those incentives being transparent, staff suggestions may be treated with suspicion.	• Contributes to uncertainty and doubt, possibly affecting trust.
8. When concerns about a particular incident or	• Inconsistent approach to dealing with feedback among	• Could contribute to people not raising issues

experience related to staff accountability (or performance?) are raised, the response by ICANN managers has sometimes been to set the concerns aside and not respond. [raised on call 13 April]	ICANN managers ● Organisational culture not supportive of addressing concerns when raised?	● Could contribute to concerns about staff accountability
9. Appropriate methods for addressing requests that may exceed allocated bandwidth, resources, budget, etc. [raised on call 13 April]	● Unclear decisions about priorities between competing requests for community support ● Allocation of resources internally not understood by the community.	● Insecurity in the community about what can be done and what approach to take when some additional service is needed. ● Undue pressure on staff to take on tasks beyond those assigned by their management.

This document: https://docs.google.com/document/d/12ihFgBE5lcVTfiL6wft9MsOqHaSSKnzIDd1utROosNU/edit?usp=sharing